

Table of Contents
Appendix

Report	Page
Table of Contents	Appendix-1
Benefit Cost Ratios as of October 1, 2005	Appendix-2
Land Certification	Appendix-5
Obligations by Function for Operating Projects	
Pacific Northwest Region	Appendix-8
Mid-Pacific Region	Appendix-10
Lower Colorado Region	Appendix-13
Upper Colorado Region	Appendix-15
Great Plains Region	Appendix-20
Project Repayment FY 2006	Appendix-25
Status of NEPA Compliance	Appendix-34
Status of Water Service and Repayment Contracts	Appendix-41
Summary of Irrigation Investment	Appendix-46

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2005

Project	Direct Benefits	Comment
Animas-La Plata		No benefit-cost ratio was requested by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000.
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Central Arizona Project	1.3	The ratio was computed by using the authorized interest rate of 3.25 percent. The benefit-cost ratio remained the same as in the FY 2005 Budget Justifications.
Central Valley Project American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit Folsom Dam Gate Repairs Delta Division Miscellaneous Project Programs Sacramento River Division San Felipe Division San Joaquin Division Shasta Division West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit Trinity River Division Trinity River Restoration		<p>A benefit-cost ratio is no longer available for the Central Valley Project or any of its divisions and units. Benefit estimates submitted in support of the authorization of the original project features are out of date. Continued indexing of these estimates is inappropriate, and can be misleading. Benefit data for the in-service facilities are not available due to the high cost of collecting data. Recent additions to the list of authorized program activities have been justified on the basis of environmental goals rather than economic benefits. For that reason, benefit-cost ratios do not exist for fish and wildlife restoration and improvement activities authorized since the enactment of the Trinity River Restoration Act (P.L. 98-541, October 24, 1984).</p> <p>For the San Joaquin Division - Benefit-cost ratios are not required for activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title XXXIV, P.L. 102-575.</p>
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I		Assessment of full beneficial impact of improving water quality as a result of this authorized project has not been made. Agreements with the Mexican Government concerning salinity control in the Colorado River and P.L. 93-320 authorizing Title I and Title II activities are based upon social and political justifications.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2005

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Title II - Basinwide Program		Previous agreements with the Mexican Government concerning salinity control in the Colorado River and P.L. 93-320 are based upon social and political justifications. P.L. 98-569 required construction preference be given to those projects that reduced salinity at the least cost.
Columbia/Snake River Salmon Recovery Project		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Endangered Species Conservation/Recovery Projects		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Lewis and Clark Rural Water Supply		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-246.
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 102-575.
Minidoka Northside Drain Water Management Project		Not Applicable. Action provides for environmental compliance on an existing project.
Mni Wiconi Project		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 100-516.
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2005

Perkins County		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-136.
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit		Benefit-cost ratio has not been calculated since the passage of the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.
San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
San Gabriel Basin Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
San Jose Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Program		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.

LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Animas-La Plata	1/19/82	The Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000 authorizes the construction of only those facilities necessary to divert and store water for municipal and industrial uses. Construction of any other project features authorized under P.L. 90-537 (such as irrigation) shall not be commenced without further express authorization from Congress.
Central Arizona Project	4/16/73	The projectwide land certification was completed on April 16, 1973. During project construction, supplemental land certifications were completed on lands not included in the original projectwide certification. As of July 20, 1998, sufficient land has been certified on the Gila River Reservation to satisfy the requirement for delivery of Central Arizona Project (CAP) water. Final land classification on San Xavier Existing Farm Rehabilitation and extension was completed in 2004; Final land classification for the San Carlos Apache system is now planned for FY 2007 due to an extension in the completion of planning work. Land certifications for the remaining Indian reservation will be scheduled as required.
Central Valley Project American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit	7/20/67	Land Classification Certification includes Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Foresthill, and Sly Park Unit.
Folsom Dam Gate Repairs	7/20/67	
Delta Division	7/23/82	Land Classification Certification includes Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, Broadview Water District, Contra Costa County Water District, Laguna Water District, Patterson Water District, Plain View Water District, Solado Water Districts (05/19/95), Sunflower Water District (05/19/95), and West Stanislaus Water District (11/8/96). In Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, field work is completed; the report was completed and certified on 04/99. Patterson Water District was completed in 08/97 and certified 08/99. Del Puerto Irrigation District field work is completed; the report was completed and certified in 07/01. Mendota Districts: Coehlo Family Trust field work completed 03/02; Eagle Field Water District field work completed 06/04; Fresno Slough field work completed 04/02; James Irrigation District field work completed in 2002; Laguna Water District field work completed 06/04; Traction Ranch, Melvin Hughes (Mendota Pool) field work completed 04/02; Mercy Springs

LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Central Valley Project (Cont.) Delta Division (Cont.)		Water District No. 1606 field work completed 07/02; Tranquility Irrigation District field work completed 04/02; Widren Water District field work completed 06/04; and Oro Loma Water District field work completed 06/04.
East Side Division		New Melones
Friant Division	Various dates (Beginning with 1/13/50 and going to May 1996)	Land Classification Certification includes Atwell Island Water District, Cross Valley Canal, Globe Water District, Hills Valley Irrigation District, Tri-Valley Irrigation District, Friant-Kern Canal, Madera Irrigation District (01/94), Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District, Exeter Irrigation District (7/29/91), Fresno Irrigation District (12/23/94), Garfield Water District, Lewis Creek Unit, Ivanhoe Irrigation District (10/90), Kern-Tulare Water District (01/96), Lindmore Irrigation District (03/91), Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District, Orange Cove Irrigation District, Pixley Irrigation District (08/94), Porterville Irrigation District, Saucelito Irrigation District, Shafter-Wasco Irrigation District, Stone Coral Irrigation District (07/91), Tea Pot Dome Water District (01/96), Terra Bella Irrigation District, Chowchilla Water District (10/91) and Reclassified (07/98), LaBranza Water District, Gravelly Ford Water District (09/95), International (12/95), Lower Tule River Irrigation District (08/95), Rag Gulch Water District (09/95), and Tulare Irrigation District (12/95).
Miscellaneous Project Programs	6/4/82	
Sacramento River Division	5/3/56	Extended Service Area 12/22/80. Land Classification Certification includes Feather Water District, Upper Stony Creek, Stony Creek, Glenn Valley Water District, Glide Water District, Westside Water District, Tehama-Colusa Canal, Kanawha Water District, and Orland-Artois Water District, Yolo-Zamore and Dunnigan area (10/90).
San Felipe Division	8/20/75	Hollister and Santa Clara in 1975 and Watsonville on 1/19/79. Land Certification includes Watsonville Subarea and Hollister and Santa Clara Subareas.
Trinity River Division	7/24/64	Land Classification Certification includes Bella Vista Water District (12/90), Clear Creek South Unit (07/64), and Cow Creek Unit (07/62).
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit	5/11/62	Above Elevation 470 - 2/14/79. Land classification Certification includes San Luis Water Dist., Westlands Water District (10/91), Panoche Water District, and Pleasant Valley Water District.

LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Columbia Basin Project	8/11/52 & 4/7/76	
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit	3/66	Lands included in the 250,000-acre plan were certified for gravity irrigation in March 1966. Recertification is required on those lands that are a part of the 75,000 acre plan because of change from gravity to sprinkler irrigation. The 5,000 acres for the Oakes Test Area were recertified in April 1981. Further progress on land certification is on hold as a result of the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000, except for the 2,380 acres on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation and for a few existing irrigated areas which are seeking preferred power.
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act	6/28/90	Final land classification on San Xavier Existing Farm Rehabilitation and extension was completed in 2004.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/		OBLIGATIONS 2/				
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2006	
Boise Project	2,038	1,845	4,713	4,529	629	598	0	0	341	345	924	750	1,254	1,211	1,921	1,940	0	0	11,820	11,218	63	5,158	5,000
Federal	470	306	0		629	598			338	345	709	600	1,254	1,211	1,821	1,940			5,221	5,000			
Water Users	1,568	1,539							3		215	150			100				1,886	1,689			
Other Agencies			4,713	4,529															4,713	4,529			
Columbia Basin-Total	4,402	4,480	83,941	74,449	2,094	1,441	12	7	503	330	623	772	435	331	2,940	3,308	213	425	95,163	85,543	155	14,577	11,663
Federal	0	0	8,113	5,319	2,094	1,441	12	7	503	330	422	502	435	331	2,940	3,308	213	425	14,732	11,663			
Water Users	4,402	4,480	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,603	4,750			
Other Agencies	0	0	75,828	69,130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75,828	69,130			
Columbia Basin-Coulee	2,916	3,035	83,941	74,449	1,929	1,265	12	7	503	330	0	0	0	0	198	130	0	0	89,499	79,216	102	10,653	7,051
Federal			8,113	5,319	1,929	1,265	12	7	503	330					198	130			10,755	7,051			
Water Users	2,916	3,035																	2,916	3,035			
Other Agencies			75,828	69,130															75,828	69,130			
Columbia Basin-Ephrata	1,486	1,445	0	0	165	176	0	0	0	0	623	772	435	331	2,742	3,178	213	425	5,664	6,327	53	3,924	4,612
Federal					165	176			0	0	422	502	435	331	2,742	3,178	213	425	3,977	4,612			
Water Users	1,486	1,445									201	270							1,687	1,715			
Other Agencies																			0	0			
Crooked River	0	0	0	0	96	108	0	0	11	100	223	134	398	1,090	180	100	0	0	908	1,532	40	710	1,107
Federal					96	108			11	100	140	84	323	715	180	100			750	1,107			
Water Users											83	50	75	375					158	425			
Deschutes Project	0	0	0	0	58	69	0	0	144	100	347	273	190	74	14	32	0	0	753	548	20	537	448
Federal					58	69			144	100	201	173	140	74	14	32			557	448			
Water Users											146	100	50						196	100			
Eastern Oregon Projects	0	0	0	0	146	154	0	0	155	125	284	315	449	270	245	142	0	0	1,279	1,006	36	1,072	906
Federal					146	154			155	125	222	215	340	270	245	142			1,108	906			
Water Users											62	100	109						171	100			
Hungry Horse	0	0	6,858	5,706	271	174	0	0	49	32	0	0	49	32	15	10	0	0	7,242	5,954	4	509	331
Federal			129	83	271	174			49	32			49	32	15	10			513	331			
Water Users																			0	0			
Other Agencies			6,729	5,623															6,729	5,623			
Minidoka Projects	2,276	2,559	6,033	6,517	419	565	0	0	710	949	1,295	1,478	452	372	1,982	1,769	0	0	13,167	14,209	43	5,050	5,808
Federal	556	694	180	243	419	565			710	949	1,018	1,291	448	372	1,762	1,694			5,093	5,808			
Water Users	1,720	1,865									277	187	4		220	75			2,221	2,127			
Other Agencies			5,853	6,274															5,853	6,274			
Rogue River	0	0	2,365	1,174	158	169	0	0	150	320	265	652	471	37	253	100	0	0	3,662	2,452	30	904	1,003
Federal					158	169			150	320	165	377	208	37	253	100			934	1,003			
Water Users											100	275	263						363	275			
Other Agencies			2,365	1,174															2,365	1,174			
Tualatin Project	61	61	0	0	41	41	73	73	169	477	346	55	50	75	62	15	0	0	802	797	65	533	622
Federal					41	41			169	477	276	14	50	75	62	15			598	622			
Water Users	61	61					73	73			70	41							204	175			
Umatilla Project	245	254	0	0	49	49	0	0	1,916	2,832	539	548	6	6	469	416	0	0	3,224	4,105	55	2,934	3,930
Federal	155	129			49	49			1,916	2,832	394	498	6	6	469	416			2,989	3,930			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL			PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/		OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	APPROPRIATED 3/	
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Water Users	90	125									145	50							235	175			
Other Agencies																			0	0			
Yakima Project	1,393	1,256	3,891	3,654	1,001	954	0	0	7,308	6,723	603	590	254	91	104	105	48	0	14,602	13,373			
Federal					1,001	954		0	7,000	6,407	403	365	254	91	104	105	48		8,810	7,922	126	8,684	7,922
Water Users	946	850							100	100	200	225							1,246	1,175			
Other Agencies	447	406	3,891	3,654					208	216									4,546	4,276			
Exam Of Existing Structures	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,599	1,575	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,599	1,575			
Federal											1,599	1,575							1,599	1,575	49	1,550	1,575
Water Users																			0	0			
Misc. Flood Control	0	0	0	0	134	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	141			
Federal					134	141													134	141		134	141
Water Users																			0	0			0
Total Obligations	10,415	10,455	107,801	96,029	5,096	4,463	85	80	11,456	12,333	7,048	7,142	4,008	3,589	8,185	7,937	261	425	154,355	142,453			
Total Appropriated	1,181	1,129	8,422	5,645	5,096	4,463	12	7	11,145	12,017	5,549	5,694	3,507	3,214	7,865	7,862	261	425	43,038	40,456	686	42,352	40,456
Total Water Users	8,787	8,920	0	0	0	0	73	73	103	100	1,499	1,448	501	375	320	75	0	0	11,283	10,991			
Total Other Agencies	447	406	99,379	90,384	0	0	0	0	208	216	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100,034	91,006			
% of Apprp. Funds	2.8%	2.8%	19.9%	14.0%	12.0%	11.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.3%	29.7%	13.1%	14.1%	8.3%	7.9%	18.6%	19.4%	0.6%	1.1%	101.6%	100.0%			

1/ Non-operating expenses includes items under the Science and Technology Program.

2/ FY05 Total Obligations include Underfinancing and Rescission.

FY05 Totals reflect OMB Passbacks.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
Central Valley Project:																							
American River Division	3,940	4,323	4,921	6,723	708	777	448	491	1,471	1,614	14	15	123	135	0	0	3,060	0	14,684	14,077			
Federal	3,940	4,323	1,953	2,143	708	777	448	491	1,471	1,614	14	15	123	135			3,060	0	11,716	9,497	61	11,655	9,497
Water Users			2,968	4,580															2,968	4,580			
CVP, Misc. Proj. Program	6,770	5,567	3,355	2,759	1,217	1,000	769	632	2,527	2,078	24	20	211	174	0	0	6,092	1,396	20,965	13,625			
Federal	6,770	5,567	3,355	2,759	1,217	1,000	769	632	2,527	2,078	24	20	211	174			6,092	1,396	20,965	13,625	26	20,939	13,625
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, Friant Division	2,558	2,602	1,268	1,290	460	468	291	296	955	971	9	9	80	81	0	0	896	0	6,516	5,716			
Federal	2,558	2,602	1,268	1,290	460	468	291	296	955	971	9	9	80	81			896	0	6,516	5,716	10	6,506	5,716
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, Wtr & Power Opern	5,100	5,425	4,009	5,044	916	975	579	616	1,903	2,025	18	19	159	169	0	0	13	0	12,698	14,273			
Federal	5,100	5,425	2,527	2,689	916	975	579	616	1,903	2,025	18	19	159	169			13	0	11,216	11,918	12	11,204	11,918
Water Users			1,482	2,355															1,482	2,355			
CVP, Delta Division	3,583	3,981	1,776	1,973	644	715	407	452	1,337	1,486	13	14	112	124	0	0	28,524	10,847	36,396	19,593			
Federal	3,583	3,981	1,776	1,973	644	715	407	452	1,337	1,486	13	14	112	124			7,924	7,447	15,796	16,193	19	15,777	16,193
Water Users																	20,600	3,400	20,600	3,400			
CVP, East Side Division	1,719	1,914	2,380	2,449	309	344	195	217	642	714	6	7	54	60	0	0	9	0	5,313	5,705			
Federal	1,719	1,914	852	948	309	344	195	217	642	714	6	7	54	60			9	0	3,785	4,204	9	3,776	4,204
Water Users			1,528	1,501															1,528	1,501			
CVP, Sacramento Rvr. Div	1,291	1,253	640	621	232	225	147	142	482	468	5	4	40	39	0	0	4,495	1,387	7,331	4,140			
Federal	1,291	1,253	640	621	232	225	147	142	482	468	5	4	40	39			4,495	1,387	7,331	4,140	61	7,270	4,140
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, San Luis Unit	4,054	3,804	2,009	1,885	729	684	460	432	1,513	1,420	14	13	126	119	0	0	6,227	3,981	15,133	12,337			
Federal	4,054	3,804	2,009	1,885	729	684	460	432	1,513	1,420	14	13	126	119			6,227	3,981	15,133	12,337	10	15,123	12,337
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, San Felipe	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	105	0	0	0	0	3	0	133	71	692	670	872	846			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	105	0	0	0	0	3	0	133	71	692	670	872	846	13	859	846
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, Shasta Division	2,842	3,760	7,421	7,006	511	676	323	427	1,061	1,404	10	13	89	117	0	0	2,237	395	14,493	13,798			
Federal	2,842	3,760	1,409	1,864	511	676	323	427	1,061	1,404	10	13	89	117			2,237	395	8,481	8,656	34	8,447	8,656
Water Users			6,012	5,142															6,012	5,142			
CVP, Trinity River Division	2,449	1,729	3,703	4,633	440	311	278	196	914	645	9	6	76	54	0	0	3,628	7,064	11,496	14,639			
Federal	2,449	1,729	1,214	857	440	311	278	196	914	645	9	6	76	54			3,628	7,064	9,007	10,863	86	8,921	10,863
Water Users	0	0	2,489	3,776															2,489	3,776			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
CVP Improvement Act	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0		0	0
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP RAX Program	8,957	10,561	4,439	5,234	1,609	1,898	1,017	1,199	3,343	3,942	31	37	279	329	0	0	0	3,387	19,676	23,200			
Federal	8,957	10,561	4,439	5,234	1,609	1,898	1,017	1,199	3,343	3,942	31	37	279	329	0		0	3,387	19,676	23,200	0	19,676	23,200
Water Users																							
Total Central Valley:																							
Federal	43,263	44,919	21,441	22,262	7,774	8,072	4,958	5,207	16,147	16,766	152	158	1,353	1,401	133	71	35,273	25,727	130,494	121,195	341	130,153	121,195
Water Users	0	0	14,479	17,354	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,600	3,400	35,079	20,754		0	0
Cachuma Project	558	598	0	0	776	538	27	50	31	39	0	0	0	0	257	351	0	0	1,649	1,576			
Federal	558	598			776	538	27	50	31	39					257	351	0	0	1,649	1,576	12	1,637	1,576
Water Users																			0	0			
Klamath Project	1,652	829	0	0	0	0	304	152	13,479	6,265	0	0	0	0	1,640	762	7,088	14,127	24,163	22,135			
Federal	1,538	715					283	131	13,479	6,265			0	0	1,640	762	7,088	14,127	24,028	22,000	22	24,006	22,000
Water Users	114	114					21	21											135	135			
Orland Project	42	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541	920	0	0	0	0	583	961			
Federal	42	41											541	920					583	961	12	571	961
Water Users																			0	0			
Solano Project	1,299	1,412	0	0	50	54	21	23	122	133	0	0	1,980	2,151	545	592	24	0	4,041	4,365			
Federal	1,299	1,412			50	54	21	23	122	133			1,980	2,151	545	592	24	0	4,041	4,365	23	4,018	4,365
Water Users																			0	0			
Lahontan Basin Projects	66	292	115	514	0	0	340	1,514	134	596	0	0	7	32	736	3,279	6,155	1,351	7,552	7,577			
Federal	66	292	115	514	0	0	340	1,514	134	596	0	0	7	32	736	3,279	6,155	1,351	7,552	7,577	7	7,545	7,577
Water Users																			0	0			
Ventura River, Lake Casita	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	468	596	0	0	468	596			
Federal													0	0	468	596			468	596	4	464	596
Water Users																			0	0			
Exam of Existing Structure	1,398	1,275	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,398	1,275			
Federal	1,398	1,275															0	0	1,398	1,275	2	1,396	1,275
Water Users																			0	0			
Land Resources Managmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	655	600	0	0	655	600			
Federal															655	600	0	0	655	600	1	654	600
Water Users																			0	0			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
Reclamation Law Admin	984	803	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	984	803			
Federal	984	803															0	0	984	803	2	982	803
Water Users		0																	0	0			
Endangered Species Recov	1,894	2,360	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,894	2,360			
Federal	1,894	2,360															0	0	1,894	2,360	1	1,893	2,360
Water Users																			0	0			
Soil & Moisture Conserv	103	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	113			
Federal	103	113															0	0	103	113	1	102	113
Water Users																			0	0			
Wtr Mgmt/Conservation	60	769	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	769			
Federal	60	769															0	0	60	769	0	60	769
Water Users																			0	0			
Total Obligations	51,319	53,411	36,036	40,130	8,600	8,664	5,649	6,945	29,913	23,798	152	158	3,880	4,504	3,966	5,656	69,140	44,605	209,123	185,079			
Total Appropriated	51,205	53,297	21,557	22,776	8,600	8,664	5,628	6,924	29,913	23,798	152	158	3,880	4,504	3,966	5,656	48,540	41,205	173,909	164,190	428	173,481	164,190
Total Water Users	114	114	14,479	17,354	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,600	3,400	35,214	20,889	0		
Total Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
% of Appropriated Funds	29.4%	32.5%	12.4%	13.9%	4.9%	5.3%	3.2%	4.2%	17.2%	14.5%	0.1%	0.1%	2.2%	2.7%	2.3%	3.4%	27.9%	25.1%	100.0%	100.0%			

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc. (Provide detail by project)

2/ FY05 Total Obligations include Underfinancing and Rescission

OBLIGATION BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/	OBLIGATIONS 2/	APPROPRIATED				
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	
Ak Chin Water Rts Stn	6,753	7,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,753	7,200			
Federal	6,753	7,200																	6,753	7,200	5	6,748	
Water Users	0	0																	0	0		7,200	
CAP Distribut Sys O&M	143	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	135			
Federal	103	95																	103	95	11	92	
Water Users	40	40																	40	40		95	
CRBSCP, Title I	692	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,726	10,773	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,418	10,773			
Federal	692	0									9,626	10,673							10,318	10,673	0	10,318	
Water Users											100	100							100	100		10,673	
Lower CO Rvr Ops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,335	21,250	5,674	7,763	0	0	0	0	0	0	21,009	29,013			
Federal									8,001	10,225	5,580	7,669							13,581	17,894	0	13,581	
Water Users									7,334	11,025	94	94							7,428	11,119		17,894	
Parker-Davis Project	0	0	5,794	6,740	2,468	2,545	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,262	9,285			
Federal			0	0	0	0											0	0	0	0	0	0	
Water Users			5,794	6,740	2,468	2,545											0	0	8,262	9,285		0	
Salt River Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697	550	0	0	697	550			
Federal															442	300			442	300	1	441	
Water Users															255	250			255	250		300	
So Arizona Wtr Rights	1,571	1,571	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,571	1,571			
Federal																			0	0	0	0	
Water Users																			0	0		0	
Other Federal	1,571	1,571																	1,571	1,571			
Yuma Area Projects	2,113	2,452	0	0	18,312	17,474	0	0	324	1,176	0	0	0	0	952	1,048	0	0	21,701	22,150			
Federal	2,113	2,452			18,262	17,424			324	1,176					952	1,048	0	0	21,651	22,100	37	21,614	
Water Users					50	50											0	0	50	50		22,100	
Environ Prog Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	52	0			
Federal									50	0					2	0			52	0	52	0	
Water Users																		0	0		0		
Exam of Exist Struct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707	700	0	0	0	0	0	0	707	700			
Federal											677	700							677	700	2	675	
Water Users											30	0							30	0		700	
Land Resource Mgmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,741	1,580	0	0	1,741	1,580			
Federal															1,741	1,580			1,741	1,580	1	1,740	
Water Users																			0	0		1,580	
Misc Flood Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	83			
Federal							85	83											85	83	1	84	
Water Users																			0	0		83	

OBLIGATION BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM								
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006		FY 2005	FY 2006
Reclam Law Admin	619	350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	619	350			
Federal	619	350																	619	350	15	604	350
Water Users																			0	0			
Rec & F&WL Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	956	1,325	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	956	1,325			
Federal									756	700									756	700	9	747	700
Water Users									200	625									200	625			
Water Mgmt & Cons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,667	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,667	0			
Federal											1,667	0							1,667	0	49	1,618	0
Water Users																			0	0			
WCFSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,825	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,825			
Federal												0	2,850						0	2,850	0	0	2,850
Water Users												0	975						0	975			
Total Obligations	11,891	11,708	5,794	6,740	20,780	20,019	85	83	16,665	23,751	17,774	23,061	0	0	3,392	3,178	0	0	76,381	88,540			
Total Appropriated	10,280	10,097	0	0	18,262	17,424	85	83	9,131	12,101	17,550	21,892	0	0	3,137	2,928	0	0	58,445	64,525	183	58,262	64,525
Total Other Federal	1,571	1,571	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,571	1,571			
Total Water Users	40	40	5,794	6,740	2,518	2,595	0	0	7,534	11,650	224	1,169	0	0	255	250	0	0	16,365	22,444			
% of Appropriated Fun	17.6	15.6	0.0	0.0	31.2	27.0	0.1	0.1	15.6	18.8	30.0	33.9	0.0	0.0	5.4	4.5	0.0	0.0	100	100			
Permanent O&M																							
Boulder Canyon Project			83,083	80,974													0	0	83,083	80,974			
Federal			83,083	80,974													0	0	83,083	80,974	368	82,715	80,974
Water Users			0	0													0	0	0	0			
Permanent O&M																							
Appropriations			83,083	80,974	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82,715	80,974	368	82,715	80,974
Grand Totals																							
LC Region O&M	10,280	10,097	83,083	80,974	18,262	17,424	85	83	9,131	12,101	17,550	21,892	0	0	3,137	2,928	0	0	141,160	145,499	551	140,977	145,499

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.

2/ Funding for SSA is in Bureauwide Security Budget in FY 2006 (\$210,000).

3/ FY05 Total Obligations include Underfinancing and Rescission

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/	OBLIGATIONS 2/						
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006				
Balmorhea Project										24										24				
Federal										24										24			0	24
Water Users																								
Bonneville Unit,CUP					22	22					607	571	69	36	297	308	5,112	4,200	6,107	5,137				
Federal					22	22					607	571	69	36	297	308	5,112	4,200	6,107	5,137		6,107	5,137	
Water Users																								
Bostwick Park Project											201	215			29	38			230	253				
Federal											201	215			29	38			230	253		230	253	
Water Users																								
Carlsbad Project					1,996	894			236	1,724	645	267			419	396			2,402	3,281				
Federal					601	732			236	1,724	645	267			419	396			1,901	3,119		1,901	3,119	
Water Users					501	162													501	162				
Collbran Project			1,008	1,004							266	355			69	84			1,343	1,443				
Federal			1,008	1,004							266	355			69	84			1,343	1,443		1,343	1,443	
Water Users																								
Dallas Creek Project					40	42					168	291	215		169	82			592	415				
Federal					40	42					168	291	110		169	82			487	415		487	415	
Water Users													105						105					
Dolores Project			436	436							1,137	999			109	80			1,682	1,515				
Federal											985	855			109	80			1,094	935		1,094	935	
Water Users																								
Other Agencies			436	436							152	144							588	580				
Eden Project											38	34	61	25	88	65			187	124				
Federal											38	34	61	25	88	65			187	124		187	124	
Water Users																								
Emery County Project											94	74	25		71	62			190	136				
Federal											94	74	25		71	62			190	136		190	136	
Water Users																								
Florida Project					45	36					107	163			60				212	199				
Federal					45	36					107	163			60				212	199		212	199	
Water Users																								
Fruitgrowers Dam Project											157	148			60				217	148				
Federal											157	148			60				217	148		217	148	
Water Users																								

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/	OBLIGATIONS 2/		APPROPRIATED			
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006						FY 2005	FY 2006
Grand Valley, CRBSCP										395	896	632			41	159			937	1,186			
Federal										395	675	349			41	159			716	903		716	903
Water Users																							
Other Agencies											221	283							221	283			
Hammond Project											48	66			29	58			77	124			
Federal											48	66			29	58			77	124		77	124
Water Users																							
Hyrum Project											44	53	27	17	107	85			178	155			
Federal											44	53	27	17	107	85			178	155		178	155
Water Users																							
Jensen Unit, CUP						35					80	80	13	10	295	117			388	242			
Federal						35					80	80	13	10	295	117			388	242		388	242
Water Users																							
Lyman Project											25	50	5	5	5	5			35	60			
Federal											25	50	5	5	5	5			35	60		35	60
Water Users																							
Mancos Project											161	155			71	19			232	174			
Federal											161	155			71	19			232	174		232	174
Water Users																							
Middle Rio Grande Project	1,221	1,118							12,015	14,680	16,886	10,533			249	252			30,371	26,583			
Federal									12,015	8,215	16,886	10,533			249	252			29,150	19,000		29,150	19,000
Water Users	1,221	1,118								6,465									1,221	7,583			
Moon Lake Project											22	27	16	5	10	8			48	40			
Federal											22	27	16	5	10	8			48	40		48	40
Water Users																							
Navajo Unit, CRSP									160		88	62	198	217	10				456	279			
Federal									160		88	62	103	110	10				361	172		361	172
Water Users																							
Non-Federal													95	107					95	107			
Other Agencies																							
Newton Project											19	23	39	27	23	16			81	66			
Federal											19	23	39	27	23	16			81	66		81	66
Water Users																							

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL			PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/		OBLIGATIONS 2/	C/O	APPROPRIATED		
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2005	FY 2006		
Ogden River Project											81	65	6	6	254	192			341	263			
Federal											81	65	6	6	254	192			341	263		341	263
Water Users																							
Paonia Project					27	38					181	166	1	23	59				268	227			
Federal					27	38					181	166	0	15	59				267	219		267	219
Water Users													1	8					1	8			
Non-Federal																							
Other Agencies																							
Paradox Unit, CRBSCP											2,795	2,795			15	10			2,810	2,805			
Federal											2,106	2,107			15	10			2,121	2,117		2,121	2,117
Water Users																							
Other Agencies											689	688							689	688			
Pecos River Basin Water Sal											229	331							229	331			
Federal											79	181							79	181		79	181
Water Users											150	150							150	150			
Pine River					37	38					99	117			6	87			142	242			
Federal					37	38					99	117			6	87			142	242		142	242
Water Users																							
Other Agencies																							
Provo River Project			244	244					1,288	1,288	230	300	17	17	288	234			2,067	2,083			
Federal			244	244					418	418	230	300	17	17	288	234			1,197	1,213		1,197	1,213
Water Users																							
Other Agencies									870	870									870	870			
Rio Grande Project	589	600	1,711	1,683							2,065	2,406			393	535			4,812	5,301			
Federal			1,711	1,683					54	77	2,065	2,406			393	535			4,223	4,701		4,223	4,701
Water Users	589	600																	589	600			
San Juan-Chama Project							1,521	1,412			337	315			50	100			1,958	1,777			
Federal											337	315			50	100			437	365		437	365
Water Users							1,521	1,412											1,521	1,412			
San Luis Valley, Closed Basin									235	237	4,762	5,480			44	38			5,041	5,755			
Federal									235	237	4,762	5,480			44	38			5,041	5,755		5,041	5,755
Water Users																							
San Luis Valley, Conejos					9	10										4			9	14			
Federal					9	10										4			9	14		9	14
Water Users																							

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/	OBLIGATIONS 2/					
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2005	FY 2006		
Scofield Project											22	27	33	18	76	68			131	113			
Federal											22	27	33	18	76	68			131	113		131	113
Water Users																							
Seedskadee Unit													30	48					30	48			
Federal													30	48					30	48		30	48
Water Users																							
Silt Project											268	194	2,272	274	59	71			2,599	539			
Federal											268	194	472	140	59	71			799	405		799	405
Water Users																							
Non-Federal													1,800	134					1,800	134			
Other Agencies																							
Smith Fork Project											291	144	175	312	46				512	456			
Federal											291	144		159	46				337	303		337	303
Water Users																							
Non-Federal													175	153					175	153			
Other Agencies																							
Strawberry Valley Project											84	83	5	5	112	97			201	185			
Federal											84	83	5	5	112	97			201	185		201	185
Water Users																							
Tucumcari											13	20			0	43			13	63			
Federal											13	20				43			13	63		13	63
Water Users																							
Uncompahgre Project											189	213	3		163	85			355	298			
Federal											189	213	3		163	85			355	298		355	298
Water Users																							
Vernal Unit, CUP											75	69	14	10	123	90			212	169			
Federal											75	69	14	10	123	90			212	169		212	169
Water Users																							
Weber Basin Project											400	598	2,567	2,573	470	277	250		3,687	3,448			
Federal											400	598	1,317	1,323	470	277	250		2,437	2,198		2,437	2,198
Water Users																							
Non-Federal													1,250	1,250					1,250	1,250			
Other Agencies																							

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
Weber River Project											127	80	25	17	26	24			178	121			
Federal											127	80	25	17	26	24			178	121		178	121
Water Users																							
Exam of Existing Structures											405	415							405	415			
Federal											405	415							405	415		405	415
Water Users																							
Land Res Management Prog															930	714			930	714			
Federal															930	714			930	714		930	714
Water Users																							
Neg/Admin of Water Marketing											160	160							160	160			
Federal											160	160							160	160		160	160
Water Users																							
Public Access/ Safety Prog											172	172							172	172			
Federal											172	172							172	172		172	172
Water Users																							
Reclamation Law Admin	339	182																	339	182			
Federal	339	182																	339	182		339	182
Water Users																							
Rec & Fish/Wildlife Prog Admin									140	95			32						172	95			
Federal									140	95			32						172	95		172	95
Water Users																							
Water Mgmt Conserv Program											1,466	1,719							1,466	1,719			
Federal											1,466	1,719							1,466	1,719		1,466	1,719
Water Users																							
Total Obligations	2,149	1,900	3,399	3,367	2,176	1,115	1,521	1,412	14,074	18,443	36,127	30,647	5,818	3,597	5,275	4,410	5,462	4,200	75,161	69,168			
Total Appropriated	339	182	2,963	2,931	781	953			13,258	11,185	34,915	29,382	2,392	1,945	5,275	4,410	5,462	4,200	65,385	55,188		65,385	55,188
Total Water Users	1,810	1,718			501	162	1,521	1,412			6,465	150	150	106	8				4,088	9,915			
Total Non-Federal			436	436					870	870	1,062	1,115	3,320	1,644					5,688	4,065			
Total Other	3,709	3,200	4,843	4,807	4,352	2,230	3,042	2,824	26,860	35,574	66,152	54,839	11,311	6,791	9,367	7,739	10,924	8,400	138,826	126,481			
% of Appropriated Funds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1			

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.

2/ FY05 Total Obligations do not include Underfinancing or Rescission

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY200	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
Arbuckle Project	0	0	0	0	27	29	0	0	154	161	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	181	200			
Federal		0		0	27	29		0	154	161		0		0		10			181	200		181	200
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Canadian River	0	0	0	0	104	32	0	0	90	84	0	0	14	68	0	10	0	0	208	194			
Federal		0		0	76	32		0	90	84		0	14	40		10			208	166		208	166
Water Users		0		0	28	0		0		0		0		28		0			28	28			
Colo-Big Thompson	1,231	2,807	14,557	15,162	0	0	0	0	11	110	361	685	0	394	447	374	0	0	16,607	19,532			
Federal	585	2574	9,557	12452		0		0	11	110	361	685		394	447	374			10,961	16,589		10,961	16,589
Water Users	646	233	5,000	2710		0		0		0		0		0		0			5,646	2,943			
Fry-Ark Project	594	886	4,761	8,431	57	382	732	585	763	858	0	0	0	90	0	425	0	0	6,907	11,657			
Federal	394	781	3,361	5631	57	382	732	585	763	858		0		90		425			5,307	8,752		5,307	8,752
Water Users	200	105	1,400	2800		0		0		0		0		0		0			1,600	2,905			
Kendrick Project	166	150	3,389	3,631	14	22	0	0	38	16.5	0	0	91	154.5	130	118	0	0	3,828	4,092			
Federal	131	150	3,389	3611	14	22		0	38	16.5		0	91	142.5	130	118			3,793	4,060		3,793	4,060
Water Users	35			20										12					35	32			
Leadville Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,771	2,322	0	0	2,771	2,322			
Federal		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	2,771	2322			2,771	2,322		2,771	2,322
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Mid-Dakota Rural	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,000	0	17,015	15			
Federal		0		0		0		0	15	15		0		0		0	17,000		17,015	15		17,015	15
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
McGee Creek	0	0	0	0	76	383	0	0	217	8	0	0	188	104	25	73	0	0	506	568			
Federal		0		0	76	383		0	217	8		0	171	87	25	73			489	551		489	551
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0	17	17		0			17	17			
Milk River	794	936	0	0	773	455	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	137	351	549	0	0	2,024	2,077			
Federal	117	292		0	773	389		0		0		0	106	137	351	489			1,347	1,307		1,347	1,307
Water Users	677	644		0		66		0		0		0		0		60			677	770			
Mirage Flat	0	0	0	0	33	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	74	0	0	115	95			
Federal		0		0	21	9		0		0		0		0	82	74			103	83		103	83
Water Users		0		0	12	12		0		0		0		0		0			12	12			
Mni Wiconi	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,254	7,053	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,351	17,516	31,605	24,569			
Federal		0		0		0	6,254	7053		0		0		0		0	25,282	17447	31,536	29,500		31,536	29,500
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	69	69	69	69			
Mountain Park	0	0	0	0	152	117	0	0	173	79	0	0	55	92	0	92	0	0	380	380			
Federal		0		0	116	117		0	173	79		0	55	67		92			344	355		344	355
Water Users		0		0	36	0		0		0		0		25		0			36	25			
Norman Project	0	0	0	0	393	112	0	0	1	98	0	0	6	195	0	80	0	0	400	485			
Federal		0		0	309	112		0	1	98		0	6	111		80			316	401		316	401
Water Users		0		0	84	0		0		0		0		84					84	84			

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY200	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
North Platte	586	614	1,021	1,115	3	31	0	0	14	14	0	0	184	382	235	312	0	0	2,043	2,468			
Federal	254	599	1,021	578	3	31	0	0	14	14	0	0	184	362	235	312			1,711	1,896		1,711	1,896
Water Users	332	15		537		0		0		0		0		20		0			332	572			
Nueces River	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	604	13	0	0	79	480	0	80	0	0	683	582			
Federal		0		0		9	0	0	561	13	0	0	79	437		80			640	539		640	539
Water Users		0		0		0	0	0	43	0		0		43		0			43	43			
Ainsworth Unit	0	0	0	0	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419	471	0	0	509	471			
Federal		0		0	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366	417			456	417		456	417
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	53	54			53	54			
Almena Unit	9	6	0	0	96	59	7	5	190	0	0	0	206	252	0	81	0	0	508	403			
Federal	9	6		0	70	49	7	5	190	0	0	0	206	252	0	65			482	377		482	377
Water Users		0		0	26	10		0		0		0		0		16			26	26			
Angostura Unit	361	17	0	0	147	1,108	0	0	37	0	0	0	77	0	121	128	0	0	743	1,253			
Federal	291	17		0	147	1035		0	37	0	0	0	77	0	121	128			673	1,180		673	1,180
Water Users	70	0		0		73		0		0		0		0		0			70	73			
Armel Unit	32	83	0	0	460	281	9	0	126	0	0	0	180	195	11	11	0	0	818	570			
Federal	32	83		0	460	281	9	0	126	0	0	0	105	120	11	11			743	495		743	495
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0	75	75		0			75	75			
Belle Fourche Unit	209	409	0	0	9	0	0	0	190	41	0	0	294	129	99	103	0	0	801	682			
Federal	109	245		0	9	0		0	190	41		0	164	129	99	103			571	518		571	518
Water Users	100	164		0		0		0		0		0	130	0		0			230	164			
Bostwick Unit	10	9	0	0	409	367	0	0	289	547	0	0	450	149	0	0	0	0	1,158	1,072			
Federal	10	9		0	45	22		0	289	547		0	450	98	0	0			794	676		794	676
Water Users		0		0	364	345		0		0		0		51		0			364	396			
Boysen Unit	23	15	1,114	1,406	244	247	0	0	11	12	24	74	211	381	172	153	0	0	1,799	2,288			
Federal	15	15	1,114	1392	244	247		0	11	12	24	44	133	318	172	153			1,713	2,181		1,713	2,181
Water Users	8	0		14		0		0		0		30	78	63		0			86	107			
Buffalo Bill Dam Mod.	0	0	3,145	3,064	121	119	0	0	14	11	0	0	135	130	116	128	0	0	3,531	3,452			
Federal		0	3,145	3064	121	119		0	14	11		0	119	130	116	105			3,515	3,429		3,515	3,429
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0	16	0		23			16	23			
Canyon Ferry Unit	44	63	2,578	3,065	118	168	1	1	0	0	0	0	1,033	1,458	145	143	0	0	3,919	4,898			
Federal	44	63	2,556	3047	118	168	1	1		0	0	0	1,033	1458	145	135			3,897	4,872		3,897	4,872
Water Users	0	0	22	18		0		0		0		0		0		8			22	26			
Cedar Bluff Unit	17	0	0	0	245	180	5	5	65	155	0	0	43	0	6	72	0	0	381	412			
Federal	17	0		0	229	180	5	5	65	155		0	43		6	56			365	396		365	396
Water Users		0		0	16	0		0		0		0				16			16	16			
Dickinson Unit	0	0	0	0	42	36	205	0	82	315	0	0	71	0	205	147	0	0	605	498			
Federal		0		0	42	21	131	0	82	290		0	71	0	205	147			531	458		531	458
Water Users		0		0		15	74	0		25		0		0		0			74	40			
East Bench Unit	325	269	0	0	159	131	1	1	56	47	0	0	470	360	148	76	0	0	1,159	884			
Federal	34	56		0	159	131	1	1	56	47		0	470	360	148	76			868	671		868	671
Reflects O&M during Constru	291	213		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			291	213			

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY200	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
Farwell Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Federal		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0		0	0
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Frenchman-Camb Unit	200	123	0	0	625	341	0	0	609	356	0	0	1,163	953	299	185	0	0	2,896	1,958			
Federal	146	123		0	474	287		0	609	356		0	1,163	799	299	185			2,691	1,750		2,691	1,750
Water Users	54	0		0	151	54		0		0		0		154		0			205	208			
Garrison Diversion Unit	0	0	0	0	367	378	3,031	3,744	32	33	0	0	9	9	68	118	25,296	26,180	28,803	30,462			
Federal		0		0	308	323	3,031	3,744	32	33		0	9	9	68	118	21,796	22,610	25,244	26,837		25,244	26,837
Water Users		0		0	59	55		0		0		0		0		0	3,500	3,570	3,559	3,625			
Glen Elder Unit	0	3	0	0	43	622	0	3	0	23	0	0	0	0	705	129	0	0	748	780			
Federal		3		0	43	622		3		23		0		0	689	113			732	764		732	764
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	16	16			16	16			
Heart Butte Unit	102	95	0	0	240	185	0	0	49	35	0	426	267	0	266	316	0	0	924	1,057			
Federal	102	95		0	230	172		0	49	35		426	267	0	266	316			914	1,044		914	1,044
Water Users		0		0	10	13		0		0		0		0		0			10	13			
Helena Valley Unit	130	137	0	0	0	0	13	14	12	12	0	0	0	0	18	40	0	0	173	203			
Federal	40	61		0		0	13	14	12	12		0		0	18	40			83	127		83	127
Water Users	90	76		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			90	76			
Kansas River Area	29	0	0	0	236	0	2	0	115	0	0	0	135	0	115	0	0	0	632	0			
Federal	29	0		0	236	0	2	0	115	0		0	135	0	115	0			632	0		632	0
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Keyhole Unit	28	122	0	0	116	482	1	3	228	291	0	0	210	0	134	119	0	0	717	1,017			
Federal	28	122		0	41	221	1	3	228	291		0	135	0	134	96			567	733		567	733
Water Users		0		0	75	261		0		0		0	75	0		23			150	284			
Kirwin Unit	0	3	0	0	262	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	39	9	0	0	301	305			
Federal		3		0	244	117		0		0		0		158	39	9			283	287		283	287
Water Users		0		0	18	18		0		0		0		0		0			18	18			
Lower Marias Unit	0	0	0	0	1,296	783	0	0	89	53	0	0	839	774	122	162	0	0	2,346	1,772			
Federal		0		0	1,296	783		0	89	53		0	839	774	122	162			2,346	1,772		2,346	1,772
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Missouri Basin Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,811	1,999	0	0	1,811	1,999			
Federal		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	1,811	1,999			1,811	1,999		1,811	1,999
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Narrows Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	89	0	0	45	89			
Federal		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	45	89			45	89		45	89
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
North Loup Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	254	0	0	246	254			
Federal		0		0	0	0		0		0		0		0	234	242	0		234	242		234	242
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	12	12			12	12			

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY200	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
North Platte Area	28	26	7,148	7,456	210	399	0	0	9	10.5	0	0	642	558.5	206	154	0	0	8,243	8,604			
Federal	0	26	7,148	7,431	210	399	0	0	9	10.5	0	0	39	428.5	206	154			7,612	8,449		7,612	8,449
Water Users	28	0		25		0		0		0		0	603	130		0			631	155			
Oahe Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	100	0	0	266	176			
Federal		0		0		0	96	76		0		0		0	170	100			266	176		266	176
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Owl Creek Unit	57	49	0	0	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	29	32	0	0	132	124			
Federal	57	49		0	24	21		0		0		0	22	22	29	32			132	124		132	124
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Rapid Valley - Pactola	0	0	0	0	90	108	92	106	18	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	201	236			
Federal		0		0	90	108	92	106	18	21		0		0	1	1			201	236		201	236
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Riverton Unit	0	0	298	403	45	45	0	0	19	18.5	14	24	39	38.5	393	345	0	0	808	874			
Federal		0	298	403	45	45		0	19	18.5	14	14	39	38.5	393	345			808	864		808	864
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		10		0		0			0	10			
Sargent Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Federal		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0		0	0
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0		0	0
Shadehill Unit	0	0	0	0	157	225	0	0	35	42	0	0	38	41	76	100	0	0	306	408			
Federal		0		0	157	205		0	35	42		0	38	41	76	100			306	388		306	388
Water Users		0		0		20		0		0		0		0		0			0	20			
Webster Unit	113	8	0	0	959	223	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	413	74	199	0	0	1,146	843			
Federal	97	8		0	918	181		0		0		0		413	74	183			1,089	785		1,089	785
Water Users	16	0		0	41	42		0		0		0		0		16			57	58			
Yellowtail Unit	0	0	4,060	6,147	132	356	6	17	16	42	0	0	0	0	34	29	0	0	4,248	6,591			
Federal		0	4,060	6,147	132	356	6	17	16	42		0		0	34	29			4,248	6,591		4,248	6,591
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Rapid Valley	27	43	0	0	9	5	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	37	71			
Federal	6	22		0	9	5		22		0		0		0	1	1			16	50		16	50
Water Users	21	21		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			21	21			
San Angelo	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	301	161	0	0	108	128	0	76	0	0	409	374			
Federal						9			301	161			95	115		76			396	361		396	361
Water Users													13	13					13	13			
Shoshone	207	31	753	436	152	41	0	0	7	10	20	114	107	112	161	160	0	0	1,407	904			
Federal	174	31	753	436	152	41		0	7	10	20	62	107	112	161	110			1,374	802		1,374	802
Water Users	33	0		0		0		0		0		52		0		50			33	102			
WC Austin	0	0	0	0	344	296	0	0	1	16	0	0	202	63	0	161	0	0	547	536			
Federal		0		0	344	296		0	1	16		0	192	53		161			537	526		537	526
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0	10	10		0			10	10			

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY200	FY 2005	FY 2006
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2006							
Washita	0	0	0	0	1,197	1,079	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	32	0	173	0	0	1,197	1,316			
Federal		0		0	1,066	948		0		32		0		32		173			1,066	1,185		1,066	1,185
Water Users		0		0	131	131		0		0		0		0					131	131			
Wichita	0	0	0	0	0	187	0	0	0	153	0	0	0	255	702	100	0	0	702	695			
Federal		0		0		187		0		153		0		155	578	100			578	595		578	595
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		100	124	0			124	100			
Environ Prog Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802	882			
Federal		0		0		0		0	802	882		0		0	0	0			802	882		802	882
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Exam of Exist Struct	1,578	1,463	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,578	1,463			
Federal	1,572	1,463		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			1,572	1,463		1,572	1,463
Water Users	6	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			6	0			
Land Resource Mgmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,399	2,803	0	0	3,399	2,803			
Federal		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	3,399	2803			3,399	2,803		3,399	2,803
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Misc Flood Control	0	0	0	0	403	407	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	403	407			
Federal		0		0	403	407		0		0		0		0		0			403	407		403	407
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Nego & Admin of Wtr	1,556	1,668	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,556	1,668			
Federal	1,539	1585		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			1,539	1,585		1,539	1,585
Water Users	17	83		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			17	83			
Public Access & Sfty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	313	0	0	0	0	286	313			
Federal		0		0		0		0		0		0	286	313		0			286	313		286	313
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Rec & F&WL Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	232	0	0	379	408	0	0	0	0	601	640			
Federal		0		0		0		0	222	232		0	379	408		0			601	640		601	640
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Reclam Law Admin	896	465	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	896	465			
Federal	896	465		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			896	465		896	465
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Site Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0		0	0
Water Users		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			0	0			
Water Mgmt & Cons	1,418	2,293	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,418	2,293			
Federal	1,295	2175		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			1,295	2,175		1,295	2,175
Water Users	123	118		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			123	118			
Total Obligations	10,770	12,793	42,824	50,316	10,679	10,616	10,455	11,635	5,704	5,008	419	1,323	8,339	9,429	14,597	13,886	67,647		171,462	163,701			
Total Appropriated	8,023	11,121	36,402	44,192	9,628	9,501	10,381	11,635	5,661	4,983	419	1,231	7,322	8,604	14,392	13,592	64,078		156,334	149,915	0	156,334	149,915
Total Water Users	2,747	1,672	6,422	6,124	1,051	1,115	74	0	43	25	0	92	1,017	825	205	294	3,569		15,128	13,786			
% of Appropriated Funds	5.1%	7.4%	23.3%	29.5%	6.2%	6.3%	6.6%	7.8%	3.6%	3.3%	0.3%	0.8%	4.7%	5.7%	9.2%	9.1%	41.0%		100.0%	100.0%			

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.

2/ FY05 Total Obligations do not include Underfinancing or Rescission

FY06 Totals reflect OMB Passbacks.

Project Repayment FY 2006 Appendix

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2006										
(\$ In Thousands)										
Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Animas-La Plata <u>1/</u>	<u>1/</u>	<u>1/</u>	<u>1/</u>	N/A	<u>1/</u>	<u>1/</u>	0	0	<u>1/</u>	\$522,003
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project <u>2/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	70,775	0	0	20,000	90,775
Central Arizona Project <u>3/</u>	31,468	738,562	1,127,934	0	240,176	395,949	1,013,894	434,482	1,431,580	5,414,045
Central Valley Project:										
Auburn-Folsom South <u>4/</u>	1,798,314	521,787	193,120	0	0	8,374	0	2,425	427,787	2,951,807
American River Division Folsom Dam <u>5/</u>	125,139	36,310	13,439	0	0	100	0	0	31,117	206,105
Delta Division <u>6/</u>	127,131	36,887	13,652	0	0	91,130	0	0	282,649	551,449
Miscellaneous Project Programs <u>7/</u>	197,885	57,417	21,251	0	0	150,878	0	0	482,821	910,252
Sacramento River Division <u>8/</u>	245,447	71,217	26,358	0	0	28,643	0	54,450	111,338	537,453
San Felipe Division <u>9/</u>	83,934	0	259,300	0	0	447	0	0	38,274	381,955
San Joaquin Division <u>10/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	120,875	0	0	762,418	883,293
Shasta Division <u>11/</u>	116,066	33,677	12,464	0	0	35,611	0	0	111,315	309,133
Trinity River Restoration <u>12/</u>	165,094	47,903	17,729	0	0	4,863	0	0	162,973	398,562
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit <u>13/</u>	1,342,690	0	144,190	0	0	241,673	0	0	317,113	2,045,666
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I Division <u>14/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453,790	453,790
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title II Division: Basinwide Program <u>15/</u>	0	0	0	0	75,000	0	0	0	175,000	250,000
Lewis & Clark RWS <u>16/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	83,315	0	0	302,448	385,763
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project <u>17/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	56,508	0	0	18,836	75,344
Mid-Dakota Rural Water <u>18/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mni Wiconi Project <u>19/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	17,247	0	0	409,069	426,316
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project <u>20/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	60,330	0	0	20,000	80,330
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I <u>21/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	412,600	0	0	20,000	432,600

Project Repayment FY 2006 Appendix

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2006 (\$ In Thousands)										
Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Perkins County <u>22/</u>						4,522			20,684	25,206
Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse Project <u>23/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	0	0	20,000	80,000
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Garrison Diversion Unit <u>24/</u>	115,960	37	417,945	0	0	155,358	12,570	0	1,110,648	1,812,518
San Diego Area Water <u>25/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	517,770	0	0	172,590	690,360
San Gabriel Basin <u>26/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	114,270	0	0	38,090	152,360
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act <u>27/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68,331	68,331

1/ Consultation regarding Interim Cost Allocation is currently underway with Cost share Partners and Project Sponsors as a result of recent increases in the Construction Cost Estimate. "Total" column cost represents the \$500,000,000, January 2003 Construction Cost Estimate indexed to the October 2005 level of \$522,003,000.

2/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$70,775,000 from Calleguas Municipal Water District.

Non-reimbursable: \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.

3/ **Irrigators, Power, Municipal and Industrial Water, Ad Valorem (\$1,897,963,749):** This total includes \$1,604,287,000 repayment obligation of the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (an additional \$45,713,000 will be met through performance of in-kind services as shown below under Non-Federal Share), a projected \$126,484,749 repayment of Tucson Terminal Storage, net interim revenues of \$146,692,000 from the sale of energy and water from 1974 through 1993, and prepayment for repayment delay of \$20,500,000 made in 1992.

Other (\$240,176,222): Amounts consist of reimbursable costs to be repaid by entities other than the Central Arizona Water Conservation District and Navajo Layoff Contracts: Non-Indian Distribution Systems, \$238,437,470 which includes the Harquahala Valley and Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage Districts. Harquahala's repayment debt was extinguished by relinquishing their water rights in December 1992. Hohokam's was reassigned to the central Arizona cities to satisfy their Cliff Dam replacement water in December 1993; Arizona's central cities will pay \$1,738,752 under the Plan 6 Upfront Funding agreement for the increased hydrogeneration resulting from the additional storage space in T. Roosevelt Reservoir.

Non-Federal Share (\$395,948,863): Consists of State and other governmental entities contributions. The amount of allocated costs which have been contributed by non-Federal entities is Arizona, \$985,000; New Mexico, \$300,000; the Non-Indian Distribution Systems entities, \$59,433,863; Salt River Project for Roosevelt Dam Powerplant, \$638,478; City of Tucson for Tucson Pipeline, \$84,039; Central Arizona Water Conservation District for delay of the New River Siphon, \$98,645 and \$45,713,000 for repair of siphon and other deficiencies; Maricopa County for Castle Hot Springs Road, \$861,838; Maricopa County for recreation, \$12,042,000; in-kind services contributed for recreation associated with the Central Arizona Project aqueduct and Tucson Terminal Storage Reservoir, \$14,315,000; Plan 6 entities \$228,087,000 (contributed by Central Arizona Water Conservation District, \$175,000,000; Arizona cities, \$43,121,000; Maricopa County Flood Control District, \$9,966,000); and interest during construction credit for interest bearing functions of the Plan 6 Up Front Funding Agreement contributions, \$33,390,000.

Leavitt Act (\$1,013,894,277): The amount of costs allocated to Indian irrigation which is eligible for deferral under the Leavitt Act. The Leavitt Act permits repayment to be deferred as long as the land is in Indian ownership and repayment is within the land's repayment capability.

Deferred (\$434,482,163): Unallocated repayment costs include \$376,283,000 for the Middle Gila Division and the Upper Gila Division which cannot be allocated unless the beneficiaries and repayment entities are identified and functions determined and \$58,199,163 for the Drainage Division. Construction for these features has been deferred indefinitely.

Non-reimbursable (\$1,431,580,193): Costs include Colorado River Division, \$900,277; Indian Distribution Division, \$705,188,000; recreation, \$132,783,053; flood control, \$122,784,020; Pima County flood and erosion control, \$3,500,000; cultural resources, \$44,658,233 contributed investigation costs, \$963,000, and siphon repair costs, \$50,920,000; and environmental enhancement costs, \$288,000. In addition, \$369,595,610 is determined to be non-reimbursable as a result of the Stipulated Settlement negotiated by the Department of Justice. Historically, based on Reclamation's cost allocation methodology, these costs exceeded the repayment ceiling and were considered reimbursable. That was challenged by the Central Arizona Water Conservation District. The Department of Justice negotiated a Stipulated Settlement of the very complex repayment litigation between the United States and the Central Arizona Water Conservation District regarding operations and repayment of the Central Arizona Project. The judge issued an Order on May 9, 2000 staying litigation for three years to allow all conditions of the Stipulated Settlement to be met. On April 9, 2003 CAWCD and the United States agreed to extend the date to complete these conditions. A revised Stipulation was approved by the court on April 24, 2003, which extends the date for meeting the conditions and requirements to May 9, 2012. Many issues were at stake beyond the repayment amount. The Federal Government received non-monetary assets and benefits which, when added to the risk of continued litigation, are considered adequate compensation in exchange for these unrecoverable costs. These non-monetary assets and benefits include, but are not limited to, an increased allocation of Federal water of approximately 200,000 acre-feet which would be available to the Secretary to settle future Indian water right claims, agreement with Central Arizona Water Conservation District on the uses of project revenues and many operational issues including water delivery pricing to tribal water users, clarification of deficiency and completion items, establishment of a fixed interest bearing portion of repayment, and a means to terminate the lengthy and costly litigation. Reclamation considers classifying these costs "non-reimbursable" as the most accurate way to describe them. They have not been determined as non-

reimbursable through the usual application of Reclamation law, but rather as a result of the Stipulated Settlement, which limits the repayment ceiling to \$1,650,000,000. Under the Stipulated Settlement, such costs may not be reimbursed to the U.S. Treasury unless future project revenues are sufficient, after meeting numerous other project purposes, to be returned to the Treasury. Therefore the amount of project costs that are reimbursable and non-reimbursable will depend on whether the Settlement conditions are met and the Settlement becomes finalized.

- 4/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$8,374,000 for State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation (50 percent of current estimate of cost of planned Auburn Lake recreation facilities).

Deferred Use (\$2,425,000): Actual cost of providing additional capacity in the completed portion of the Folsom South Canal (Reaches 1 and 2) to serve the planned Eastside Division service area as authorized under Section 1, P.L. 89-161.

Non-reimbursable (\$427,787,000): Includes recreation, \$15,636,000; fish and wildlife, \$278,211,000; flood control, \$124,947,000; and navigation, \$8,993,000.

- 5/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$100,000 for El Dorado Irrigation District's share of costs of recreation on facilities at Sly Park Reservoir.

Non-reimbursable (\$31,117,000): Includes \$100,000 for recreation facilities at Sly Park Reservoir, \$8,695,000 for flood control, \$626,000 for navigation, and \$21,696,000 for safety of dams program activities completed for Folsom Dam under the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978, November 2, 1978 (P.L. 95-578), as amended in 1984 by P.L. 98-404.

- 6/ **Non-Federal Share (\$91,130,000):** Includes \$91,025,000 for State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575); and \$105,000 for East Bay Regional Parks District share of costs of recreation facilities at Contra Loma Reservoir.

Non-reimbursable (\$282,649,000): Includes \$100,000 for recreation, \$273,080,000 for fish and wildlife, \$8,833,000 for flood control, and \$636,000 for navigation.

- 7/ **Non-Federal Share (\$150,878,000):** Includes \$26,000 for County of Fresno share of costs of recreation facilities at Lake Woollomes; \$10,000 of contributions by non-Federal, local entities towards cost of preconstruction investigations completed for the Allen Camp Unit, Pit River Division; and \$150,842,000 for State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575).

Non-reimbursable (\$482,821,000): Includes \$468,064,000 for fish and wildlife; \$28,000 for recreation facilities at Lake Woollomes in Fresno County, California; \$13,749,000 for flood control; and \$980,000 for navigation.

- 8/ **Power Users (\$71,217,000):** Current estimate of the total power revenue assistance requirement for 20 irrigation water service contractors located in the Black Butte Dam and Reservoir (Stony Creek), Corning Canal, and Tehama-Colusa Canal service areas. This estimate is based on the results of the Payment Capacity Analysis for Tehama-Colusa Water Users Association completed in October 1994. This ability to pay study will be updated every 5 years in accordance with Section 105 of the Act of October 27, 1986 (P.L. 99-546).
- Non-Federal Share (\$28,643,000):** Represents State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575), as follows: \$11,046,000 for fish screens and fish recovery facilities associated with the Hamilton City Pumping Plant (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), and \$17,597,000 for alternative fish passage facilities at Red Bluff Diversion Dam.
- Deferred Use (\$54,450,000):** Incremental cost of providing extra capacity and elevation in Tehama-Colusa Canal (Reaches 5-8A) to enable future water service to the planned West Sacramento Canal Unit service area, as authorized under Section 1 of the Act of August 19, 1967 (P.L. 90-65).
- Non-reimbursable (\$111,338,000):** Includes \$282,000 for recreation, \$92,761,000 for fish and wildlife, \$17,054,000 for flood control, \$1,227,000 for navigation, and \$14,000 for preservation of historical and archaeological data under the Act of June 27, 1960 (P.L. 86-23).
- 9/ **Non-Federal Share (Local Interests \$447,000):** Includes \$397,000 for non-Federal share of costs of recreation facilities to be repaid by the County of San Benito under Section 3 of P.L. 90-72, and \$50,000 for cash contribution by the San Felipe Committee for preconstruction studies.
- Non-reimbursable (\$38,274,000):** Includes \$18,933,000 for recreation, \$19,087,000 for fish and wildlife, \$-50,000 for preconstruction investigations, \$199,000 for interest during construction, and \$105,000 for archeological, cultural and historical resources.
- 10/ **Non-Federal Share (\$120,875,000):** Includes \$107,551,000 for water acquisition program and \$13,324,000 for San Joaquin Basin Action Plan.
- Non-reimbursable:** Includes \$762,418,000 for fish and wildlife.
- 11/ **Non-Federal Share (\$35,611,000):** Represents State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575), as follows: \$22,082,000 for Shasta Temperature Control Device, \$4,299,000 for Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District, \$8,782,000 for Clear Creek Restoration, and \$448,000 for spawning gravel.
- Non-reimbursable (\$111,315,000):** Includes \$102,671,000 for fish and wildlife, \$8,064,000 for flood control, and navigation for \$580,000.

- 12/ **Non-Federal Share (\$4,863,000):** The State of California and the counties of Humboldt and Trinity in California will pay to the Treasury of the United States an amount equal to 15 percent of the total amount of money that is expended for carrying out Grass Valley Creek activities, under Section 4(b) of the Act of October 24, 1984 (P.L. 98-541).
- Non-reimbursable (\$162,973,000):** Includes \$611,000 for recreation, \$150,065,000 for fish and wildlife, \$11,471,000 for flood control, and \$826,000 for navigation.
- 13/ **Non-Federal Share (\$241,673,000):** Includes \$3,943,000 for the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, share of the costs of recreation facilities at B.F. Sisk San Luis Reservoir, Los Banos Reservoir, San Luis Canal, and O'Neill Forebay; \$237,730,000 for the State of California, Department of Water Resources, share of the Joint State-Federal water facilities, under Section 10(b) of Federal-State Contract No. 14-06-200-9755, December 31, 1961, and Sections 9(d) and 30 of Contract No. 14-06-200-9755 Supplement No. 1.
- Non-reimbursable (\$317,113,000):** Includes \$3,226,000 for recreation; \$207,723,000 for fish and wildlife; \$93,290,000 for flood control; \$6,714,000 for navigation; \$4,770,000 for nonreimbursable portion of Safety of Dams costs at CVP, San Luis Unit; \$7,000 for preservation of historical and archaeological data under P.L. 86-523; and \$1,383,000 for incremental costs of improving existing roads to higher standards required for project construction (P.L. 87-874).
- 14/ **Non-reimbursable (\$453,790,000):** Includes \$407,688,000 Mexican Treaty Measures, \$164,000 for non-reimbursable preauthorization investigation costs, and \$45,938,000 for non-reimbursable irrigation costs. A repayment contract with Coachella Valley Water District for \$45,938,000 was executed March 14, 1978 and validated June 30, 1978. The contract provided that for each year the United States receives the benefits of the water saved by the lining program because mainstream Colorado River water is delivered to California in the quantities requested under Section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, construction costs of \$1,148,000 (\$45.938 million divided by a 40-year life of the canal) will be considered non-reimbursable. In October 2003, the contract was amended to add provisions of Title II of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act. These provisions made the repayment non-reimbursable during the planning, design and construction of works associated with the settlement act and during the period that the Indian Water Authority and the local entities (as defined in Section 102 of the settlement act) receive up to 16,000 acre-feet of water conserved by the works. As a result of these provisions, all of the repayment by Coachella Valley Water District is expected to be non-reimbursable.

- 15/ **Other (\$75,000,000):** Reimbursable portion advanced from the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund and the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund per P.L. 104-127 for the Basinwide Salinity Program.
- Non-reimbursable (\$175,000,000):** P.L. 93-320, Section 205, states that 70 percent of the costs will be nonreimbursable. The remaining 30 percent is divided between the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund and the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund based on benefits derived by each Basin from the use of water of improved quality, causes of salinity, and availability of revenues, provided that costs allocated to the Upper Basin shall not exceed 15 percent of the costs allocated to the Upper and Lower Basin Funds. P.L. 104-127 authorizes the option of cost-sharing in lieu of repayment for the salinity program. Cost-sharing funds are contributed by a surcharge to CRSP power users and collected in the Basin Funds.
- 16/ **Non-Federal Share (\$83,315,000):** 50 percent of the non-Federal cost share would come from the three states of South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. The other 50 percent would come from the Lewis & Clark RWS (21 member entities).
- Non-reimbursable (\$302,448,000):** The legislation P.L. 106-246 authorizes \$213,887,700 of Federal grant funds which has been indexed to \$302,448,000 and is 80 percent of the project costs for 20 of the 21 members and 50 percent of the incremental cost for the city of Sioux Falls.
- 17/ **Non-Federal Share (\$56,208,000):** Includes \$29,640,000 from the Water Replenishment District of Southern California; and \$26,568,000 from the City of Long Beach.
- Non-reimbursable:** Includes non-reimbursable costs of \$18,736,000 provided by the Federal government as cooperative agreements.
- 18/ Project completed in FY 2005.
- 19/ **Non-Federal Share (\$17,247,000):** The amount of non-Federal cost-share will be covered by cooperative agreements with non-Indian beneficiaries prior to expenditure of Federal funds. Federal contribution to the West River/Lyman-Jones Rural Water System may not exceed 80 percent of the total cost of these systems.
- Non-reimbursable (\$404,069,000):** All of the cost of the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System, Rosebud Sioux Rural Water System, Lower Brule Sioux Water System, and 80 percent of the cost of the West River/Lyman-Jones Water Supply Systems are nonreimbursable under provision of P.L. 100-516, as amended by P.L. 103-434, and P.L. 107-367.
- 20/ **Non-Federal Share (\$60,215,000):** Includes \$12,941,250 from San Elijo Joint Powers Authority; \$27,735,000 from Carlsbad Municipal Water District, \$8,769,000 by the Leucadia Wastewater District; and \$10,769,750 from Olivenhain Municipal Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.

- 21/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$412,600,000 from Orange County Water District and/or Orange County Sanitation District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.
- 22/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$4,522,000 from Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.
- Non-reimbursable (\$20,684,000):** The legislation P.L. 106-136 authorized \$15 million of Federal grant funds, which have been indexed to \$20,684,000. 75 percent of the project is Federal grants; 25 percent of the project cost will come from Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.
- 23/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$60,000,000 from the City of Phoenix.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.
- 24/ **Reimbursable (\$546,512,000):** The reimbursable costs are \$115,960,000 for non-Indian irrigation; \$12,570,000 for Indian irrigation, which is deferred indefinitely under the Leavitt Act; \$37,000 for power; and \$417,945,000 for municipal, rural, and industrial water.
- Non-Federal Share (\$155,358,000):** Includes State municipal, rural and industrial (\$140,600,000); recreation (\$13,350,000); natural resources trust (\$1,200,000); and State contribution for headquarters building (\$207,966).
- Non-reimbursable (\$1,110,648,000):** Includes Municipal, Rural and Industrial Grant Program (\$421,820,000); fish & wildlife (\$59,840,000); Sheyenne River Release (\$44,870,000); flood control (\$64,212,000); Indian Municipal, Rural, and Industrial (\$252,200,000); recreation (\$16,986,000); Natural Resource Trust (\$37,001,000); highway improvement (\$4,650,000); cultural resources (\$5,170,000); deauthorized facilities (\$98,321,000); OM&\$ of completed facilities (\$80,578,000); and Wildlife Trust (\$25,000,000), as directed by the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.
- 25/ **Non-Federal Share (\$517,770,000):** Includes \$361,086,033 from the cities of San Diego and Poway, Sweetwater Authority, Otay Water District, County of San Diego, and/or Tia Juana Valley County Water District; \$121,883,188 from the cities of Escondido, Poway, and/or San Diego; \$3,646,827 from the City of San Diego and/or San Diego County Water Authority; and \$31,153,952 from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$172,590,000 is provided by the Federal government as grants and cooperative agreements.

- 26/ **Non-Federal Share (\$114,270,000):** Includes \$61,199,319 from the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, and/or other entities; \$36,310,500 from the Central Basin Municipal Water District; and \$16,760,181 from the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$38,090,000 is provided by the Federal government as grants and cooperative agreements.
- 27/ **Non-reimbursable (\$68,331,000):** Reclamation is seeking legal advice to verify whether costs associated with delivery of water are non-reimbursable under the Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act, or deferrable under the Leavitt Act.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Animas-La Plata Project	The Final Supplement to the 1980 Final Environmental Statement (FSFES) was filed with the EPA on April 26, 1996. In August 1998, the Secretary of the Interior presented an Administration Proposal that provided M&I water only for the tribes and non-Indian entities, and established a Water Acquisition Fund for the tribes to purchase the balance of their water rights. The Final Supplemental EIS was filed with EPA in July 2000 and Reclamation issued a Record of Decision on September 25, 2000.
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project	A categorical exclusion for the Conejo Creek Diversion component was completed in July 2000. A FONSI for the Regional Brine Line was completed in September 2002.
Central Arizona Project (CAP)	Projectwide - Final filed September 26, 1972. Additional activity-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance documents were completed on all project activities prior to implementation. Current NEPA compliance activities include final environmental impact statement for Tucson Aqueduct Reliability, which was completed on April 10, 1998. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Gila River Indian Community was issued July 20, 1998. An environmental assessment for Tohono O'Odham Nation's San Xavier District farm rehabilitation project is scheduled for completion in FY 2005, delayed due to a change in design of the system to be constructed requiring a change in the EA project descriptions and affects. An environmental impact statement on the San Xavier farm extension project is scheduled for completion in FY 2007, delayed due to a refocusing by the District on completing the farm rehabilitation project before starting the NEPA process on the extension portion of the project. The completion of the final EIS and ROD for the San Carlos Apache system is scheduled for FY 2008, delayed due to an extension in the completion of planning work. Environmental assessments for the Camp Verde, Tonto Apache, and Pascua Yaqui systems are not currently scheduled. NEPA compliance schedules for the remaining portions of the Indian Distribution Division will be determined as required.
Central Valley Projects: American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit	<p>A projectwide Final Environmental Statement (EIS) was filed with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) November 13, 1972. Supplement to final filed with CEQ August 6, 1973, Amendment to final filed with CEQ September 20, 1974. Supplemental No. 2 filed with EPA September 23, 1980. Foresthill Divide area FES was filed with the CEQ May 25, 1976. Reclamation and the Sacramento Metropolitan Water Authority wrote a draft EIS/Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the American River Water Resources Investigation in February 1996. Reclamation completed the Final EIS in November 1997 and issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in June 1998. The decision was to not take any action at this time, but Reclamation will cooperate with any local agency if there is potential Reclamation involvement.</p> <p>Placer County Water Agency American River Pump Station Project - Draft EIS/EIR released on</p>

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	September 13, 2001. Final was released June 14, 2002.
Central Valley Projects (Con't) Folsom Dam Gate Repairs	El Dorado Distribution System, May 22, 1974. Other NEPA compliance will be completed as required.
American River Division Long-Term Contract Renewal	Draft EIS due January 2005 and the final is due June 2005.
Delta Division	South Delta Barrier Program EIS/EIR was completed August 1996. This project has been incorporated into the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
Delta Long-Term Renewal Contracts	Final EA is due January 15, 2005.
Mercy Springs Water District Assignments to Westlands Water District, Santa Clara Valley Water District and Pajaro Valley Water District Long-Term Renewal Contract Portion.	Administration Draft EA is preliminary and under development. The environment analysis was separated from the larger Delta Division Long-Term Renewal Contract assessments.
Friant Division	Eastside to Westside Transfers and Exchanges. Preliminary Administrative Draft EA is under development. Final due September 30, 2005.
	Millerton Lake Resource Management Plan and General Plan Programmatic EIS/EIR under development.
Miscellaneous Project Programs	El Dorado Distribution System, May 22, 1974. NEPA compliance was not required for Friant-Kern Canal. Other NEPA compliance will be completed as required.
Sacramento River Division	Tehama-Colusa Canal, June 7, 1972; Tehama-Colusa Canal Supplemental, May 15, 1975.
Sacramento River Settlement Contracts	Draft EIS and BA is due September 20, 2004. Final EIS is due December 15, 2004. Record of decision can be signed January 16, 2005 or later.
San Felipe Division	A projectwide FES was filed with the CEQ March 8, 1976. Negative determination for conveyance system modification signed March 20, 1978. Reclamation is preparing an EIS for Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency's (PVWMA) Basin Management Plan Update Project. The proposed action includes the connection of a pipeline to the Santa Clara Conduit, and the delivery to and the use of Central Valley Project (CVP) water in the Pajaro Valley. Notice of Availability has been submitted to publish in the Federal Register. Waiting on dates to begin public comment period.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
<p>Central Valley Projects (Con't): Long-Term Renewal of CVP Contracts – San Felipe Unit</p> <p>West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit</p> <p>San Luis Unit Long-Term Contract Renewal</p> <p>San Luis Reservoir and Los Banos Creek State Recreation Area Joint General Plan and Resource Management Plan</p> <p>Shasta Division</p> <p>Trinity River Restoration Program</p>	<p>The Final Environmental Document is due January 15, 2005.</p> <p>San Luis Reservoir Low Point EIS to provide better water quality to Districts serviced by the Pacheco Tunnel (in the San Felipe Division) and Low Point in San Luis Reservoir. Notice of Intent published July 17, 2002.</p> <p>A projectwide environmental statement was filed with the CEQ October 4, 1972. A draft supplement to the final was filed with the CEQ July 30, 1979. A draft environmental statement for cleanup and closure of the San Luis Drain and Kesterson Reservoir was filed with the EPA April 30, 1986; final filed October 20, 1986. A draft Environmental Statement, as a result of the Barcellos Judgment, was filed with the EPA December 20, 1991. This plan was not accepted as complying with the Barcellos Judgment. Recent court decisions affirmed Interior's responsibility to address the drainage problem. In 2001, Reclamation began evaluating alternatives to provide long-term drainage service to the San Luis Unit.</p> <p>Record of Decision due March 30, 2005.</p> <p>Draft EIS is under development.</p> <p>Will be completed as required. The CALFED Program recommends enlarging Shasta Dam and Reservoir and Reclamation has begun this study.</p> <p>Buckhorn Debris Dam FES was filed with the EPA August 18, 1986. A Categorical Exclusion checklist for the Trinity Fish Hatchery was completed on October 6, 1983. Final EIS for Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration released November 17, 2000. Record of Decision signed December 19, 2000. Implementation of decision delayed pending outcome of ongoing litigation and completion of supplemental EIS. Supplemental EIS was put on hold July 2004, appellate court ruled supplemental EIS does not have to be completed—scheduled completion data could slip into February 2005.</p>
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I Division	A project-wide final EIS was filed with the CEQ on June 18, 1975.
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Basinwide Program	All NEPA requirements will be complied with as needed.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Columbia and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project	Applicable NEPA documentation will be completed before individual actions are undertaken.
Endangered Species Recovery Implementation	Individual NEPA compliance documents will be prepared before construction is initiated. Construction activities currently scheduled will be covered by categorical exclusions or environmental assessments.
Lewis and Clark RWS	The Project sponsor has completed the Final Engineering Report (FER), Water Conservation Program Plan and the Environmental Assessment (EA). The FONSI was signed on March 5, 2003.
Long Beach Area Water District Reclamation Project	A categorical exclusion for the Alamitos Barrier Reclaimed Water Project was completed in July 1999. A categorical exclusion for the City of Long Beach Recycled Water System Expansion Project was completed in January 1999.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project	A National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision document (i.e. FONSI) was completed March 10, 1994. A Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report was completed in conjunction with the NEPA compliance process. At the time that the EA and FONSI were prepared, the wetlands component of the Mid-Dakota Rural Water System was not prepared in sufficient detail to be fully covered by the EA and FONSI. Reclamation with assistance from the Interagency Mitigation Team, prepared a supplement to the EA for the wetland component., and a FONSI was issued December 7, 2001.
Minidoka North Side Drain Water Management Project	Programmatic NEPA compliance was accomplished in conjunction with development of the Framework Drain water Management Plan. Additional NEPA Documentation will be provided for site-specific actions.
Mni Wiconi Project	NEPA decision document (FONSI) was completed in October 1993. An amendment was signed in June 1995.
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project	A FONSI for the San Elijo Water Reclamation Project was completed July 1997. Categorical Exclusions for the Leucadia component of the Encina Basin Water Reclamation Project and Olivenhain Water Reclamation Project were completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Carlsbad component of the Encina Basin Water Reclamation Project was completed in February 2002. The NEPA for San Dieguito Groundwater Project is scheduled to be completed in September 2005.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I	The Record of Decision was completed August 14, 2000.
Perkins County	The draft EA was sent out for public comment on November 8, 2002. The public comment period ended December 9, 2002. The FONSI was signed February 3, 2003.
Phoenix Metro Water Reclamation and Reuse Project	Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement has begun. Public scoping was conducted between August 18 and October 6, 2004. The EIS is scheduled for completion in September 2006.
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit	Projectwide Financial Environmental Statement (FES) on the 250,000-acre plan was filed with the CEQ January 10, 1974. Supplemental Fish and Wildlife filed with the CEQ on May 3, 1974. Final comprehensive supplemental to FES filed with EPA on March 7, 1979. The Final Supplemental Environmental Statement on features for initial development of 85,000 acres on the 250,000-acre plan was filed with the EPA on July 15, 1983. A draft environmental statement addressing the Garrison Commission recommendations was filed with the EPA on March 6, 1986. A draft supplement to the Draft Environmental Statement was filed with the EPA on December 30, 1986. The reformulated project FES will not be pursued further due to deferral of work associated with non-Indian irrigation. In the interim, all project activities will comply with NEPA requirements as necessary. The Dakota Water Resources Act requires an EIS be completed for the Red River Valley Water Supply feature. The Draft EIS is scheduled for February 2006.
San Carlos Water Settlement Act	NEPA compliance schedule will be determined as required.
San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program	The San Diego Water Reclamation Project consists of several components, each of which requires NEPA compliance. A categorical exclusion for preconstruction activities for the North/Central Distribution System was completed in January 1995 while the FONSI for the construction was completed in December 1995. A FONSI for the North City Reclamation System Phase 1 was completed in April 2003. Categorical exclusions for the State Route 56 and Mira Sorrento Reclaimed Water Pipelines were completed in July and September 2003. NEPA completion for the North City Reclamation System Phase 2 is scheduled for completion in December 2004. Categorical exclusions for the North City Water Reclamation Plant Demineralization Facility were completed in April 1997 for the temporary facility and in December 2000 for the permanent facility. A FONSI for Phase I of the Sweetwater Authority Water Reclamation Project was completed in September 1996. A FONSI for Phase II of the Sweetwater Authority Water Reclamation Project was completed in September 1997. Categorical exclusions for Phase I of the Otay Water Reclamation Project were completed in September 1996 and June 1997. NEPA

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	<p>completion for Phase II of the Otay Water Reclamation Project is scheduled for completion in March 2005, based on revised schedule from the district. A categorical exclusion for groundwater exploration for the Tijuana River Basin Groundwater Management Program was completed in January 1996. A categorical exclusion was completed for the South Poway Distribution system in July 1999. A FONSI was completed for the South Bay Water Reclamation Plant and Dairy Mart Road Bridge Pipeline in May, 1997. A FONSI for the South Bay Sewer and Pump Station was completed in March 2000. A FONSI for the Otay River Pump Station and Conveyance System was completed in July 2001. A categorical exclusion for the first phase of the South Bay Distribution System was completed in September 2002.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Escondido Water Reclamation Project was completed in April 1995. A categorical exclusion for the planning study for the San Pasqual component of the Escondido Project was completed in July 1995. A Categorical Exclusion was completed for the San Pasqual Storage Tank in May 2001.</p> <p>A categorical exclusion for the planning studies for the San Diego Water Repurification Project was completed in January 1995. In 1999, the city of San Diego stopped work on this project.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Padre Dam Municipal Water District Reclamation Project was completed in May 1995.</p>
<p>San Gabriel Basin Project</p>	<p>Categorical Exclusions for preconstruction activities were completed in September 1994 and January 1996. A FONSI for the San Gabriel Demonstration Project was completed in March 1997. A Categorical Exclusion for the La Puente Treatability Study was completed July 1999. A Categorical Exclusion for Design Activities for the El Monte, South El Monte, and Puente Valley Operable Units was completed July 2000. A Categorical Exclusion for the San Gabriel Valley Water Company Plant No. 8 Treatment Facility was completed in September 2000. Categorical exclusions for the Monterey Park Treatment Facility were completed in June and September 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the California Domestic Water Company Well 14 Treatment Facility was completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Southern California Water Company San Gabriel Plant Treatment Facility was completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Southern California Water Company Encinita Plant Treatment Facility was completed in June 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Suburban Water Systems Extraction Wells and Pipeline was completed in April 2002.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Rio Hondo Water Recycling Program was completed in June 1994.</p> <p>A categorical exclusion for preconstruction activities was completed in April 1994. A FONSI for the San Gabriel Valley Water Reclamation Program was completed in September 1998.</p>

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
San Jose Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Program	Completed for Phase I only.
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act	The Tohono O'Odham Nation's San Xavier District FES was issued November 2, 1989, and Schuk Toak was covered by a FONSI March 21, 1989. An environmental assessment for Tohono O'Odham Nation's San Xavier District farm rehabilitation project is scheduled for completion in FY 2005, delayed due to a change in design of the system to be constructed requiring a change in the EA project descriptions and affects. An environmental impact statement on the San Xavier farm extension project is scheduled for completion in FY 2007, delayed due to a refocusing, by the District, on completing the farm rehabilitation project before starting the NEPA process on the extension portion of the project.
Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project	A programmatic EIS has been prepared to evaluate the basinwide environmental impacts/benefits of the water enhancement facilities. A Record of Decision was issued on March 10, 1999.

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
Animas-La Plata Project	<p>The downsizing of the Animas-La Plata Project to an all M&I project and the provision in P.L. 106-554 allowing up-front cost-sharing of non-tribal payment obligations required the modification or replacement of existing repayment contracts with the non-tribal entities. Appropriate agreements were executed in November 2001 with the San Juan Water Commission, New Mexico and the Colorado Water Resources and Power Development Authority to allow the up-front cost sharing. Additional repayment contracts will be negotiated prior to project water delivery. Currently, consultation is ongoing with the entities as a result of the limit upon which the cost allocation is based as provided in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Division C, Title II, Section 207, P.L. 108-447).</p>
Central Arizona Project (CAP)	<p>A repayment contract with the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) was executed on December 15, 1972, and validated on May 24, 1983. An amended contract with the CAWCD was executed on December 1, 1988, and validated on January 7, 1991. The water supply system stage of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) was placed into repayment status in October 1993, followed by the regulatory storage stage, in October 1996. Following months of unsuccessful formal negotiations between the Bureau of Reclamation and CAWCD over a variety of CAP repayment contract and operation and maintenance issues, CAWCD filed suit against the U.S. on July 10, 1995. The U.S. filed a countersuit on August 18, 1995 in the U.S. District Court. On September 20, 1995, the complaints were consolidated in the U.S. District Court with the CAWCD suit as the complaint and the U.S. suit as a counter claim. For the court proceedings, the issues in dispute were divided into six phases: (1) Repayment Ceiling; (2) Cost Allocation; (3) Development Fund Administration; (4) Water Delivery Issues; (5) Construction Defects and Miscellaneous Claims; and (6) Billing Disputes. The Court heard phase 1 in August of 1998 and on November 3, 1998, issued a phase 1 order, ruling in favor of the CAWCD. The ruling determined that the 1988 amended repayment contract limits CAWCD's repayment obligation for stages 1 and 2 to \$1.781 billion unless a further amendment to the contract is executed changing that obligation. The United States was also enjoined from barring CAWCD from utilizing CAP facilities. Phase 2 of the trial was conducted in November of 1998. Shortly after the phase 2 court proceedings, negotiations were initiated to reach a settlement outside of the courts. The court, in deference to negotiations, did not issue a phase 2 ruling. Department of Justice successfully negotiated a Stipulated Settlement that contains a number of conditions that must be achieved within three years to allow final settlement of the case. The Court issued an order on May 9, 2000, staying litigation for three years to allow the conditions of the Stipulated Settlement to be achieved. On April 9, 2003, CAWCD and the United States agreed to extend the date to complete these conditions. On December 10, 2004, the President signed PL 108-451, the Arizona Water Settlements Act. The Act, when fully effective, resolves the disputed project repayment issues.</p> <p>Under the revised plan for the third stage of repayment, Tucson Reliability, the northwestern entities and San Xavier District each have reliability features. Final plans for the remaining entities, the City of Tucson, Sif Oidak, Schuk Toak and Pascua Yaqui Tribes have not been developed, however estimates for the Black Wash reservoir were revised to reflect the reduced capacity requirement. The Black Wash feature, while re-estimated, is still tentative and may not be further developed if the current planning efforts of entities and Reclamation results in more cost effective reliability options. The sum of the current cost estimates for these three reliability features exceeds the Stage III repayment ceiling. Negotiations have started, as required under the Stipulated Settlement, to address repayment of the third stage prior to initiating construction activities for the northwest entities. Repayment is non-reimbursable under the Arizona Water Settlements Act for the San Xavier District feature.</p> <p>Except for Indian Tribes with water approved right settlements, repayment contracts with the Indian communities must be executed before initiation of construction. The Gila River Indian Community divided its obligation into phases to expedite construction. The repayment contract for Sacaton Ranch was executed March 15, 1995; the master contract for the remaining Gila River Indian Community facilities was executed July 20, 1998. The Arizona Water Settlements Act subsequently eliminated any repayment requirement for the Gila River Indian Community and the Tohono O'Odham Nation. The repayment contracts for the remaining Indian Distribution System will be executed as required.</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p>Central Arizona Project (CAP) (Continued)</p>	<p>Construction of the Non-Indian Distribution System was accomplished under Section 9(d), Reclamation Act of 1939. Ten non-Indian distribution system repayment contracts have been executed and validated. The repayment contracts for Maricopa-Stanfield Irrigation and Drainage District, Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District, and New Magma Irrigation and Drainage District were executed on November 21, 1983, and validated on November 23, 1983. The Harquahala Valley Irrigation District contract was executed January 6, 1984, and validated on April 26, 1984; Chaparral City Water Company contract was executed December 6, 1984, and validated on March 25, 1985; Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District contract was executed on April 4, 1985, and validated August 13, 1985; Chandler Heights Citrus, San Tan and Queen Creek Irrigation Districts contracts were executed December 30, 1985, and validated February 14, 1986; Tonopah Irrigation District contract was executed April 8, 1985, and validated July 24, 1985. To facilitate Indian water right settlements in Arizona, Congress granted the Secretary authority to extend, on an annual basis, the repayment schedule of debts incurred under Section 9(d) of the Act of August 2, 1939 (43 USC 485h(d)) by irrigation districts which have contracts for water delivery from the Central Arizona Project. This authority was provided in the FY 2004 Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, P.L. 108-137, Sec. 216(1). Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District, Chandler Heights Citrus Irrigation District, Maricopa Stanfield Irrigation & Drainage District, New Magma Irrigation and Drainage District, Queen Creek Irrigation District, San Tan Irrigation District and Tonopah Irrigation District requested and received extensions of the repayment debts for 2004. It is expected that these districts will continue to seek annual extensions. The Arizona Water Settlements Act provides for continued annual extensions prior to January 1, 2008. That Act also makes \$73.6 million of the 9(d) remaining debt non-reimbursable. The repayment contracts with irrigation districts having 9(d) debt must be amended to make a portion of the debt non-reimbursable and to assign repayment of the remaining portion of the debt to the Central Arizona Water Conservation District.</p> <p>On December 3, 1992, the distribution system repayment contract with the Harquahala Valley Irrigation District was extinguished under authority of P. L. 101-628. The contract was amended to discharge Harquahala Valley Irrigation District's repayment obligation. The 13,933 acre-feet of Harquahala Valley Irrigation District's water was committed for the Fort McDowell Indian Water Rights Settlement Act. The remaining 19,318 acre-feet may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for other purposes including Indian water rights settlements. Most of this remaining water is committed to the Gila River Indian Community under the Arizona Water Settlements Act. Title to the Harquahala Valley Irrigation District distribution system was transferred to the District on July 21, 2004.</p> <p>On December 21, 1993, the Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District signed an agreement with the cities of Chandler, Mesa, Phoenix, and Scottsdale; Central Arizona Water Conservation District; and Reclamation to assign its Central Arizona Project agricultural water to these cities. This fulfilled the United States obligations to secure Cliff Dam replacement water for the cities as required by congressional actions on Plan 6. The agreement also requires the cities to pay for the Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District distribution system Federal indebtedness.</p> <p>On January 18, 1994, the New Magma Irrigation and Drainage District declared Chapter 9 bankruptcy after Reclamation rejected the District's proposal to restructure the District's repayment obligation for construction of its Central Arizona Project water distribution system. The U. S. Bankruptcy Court issued a confirmation order on June 21, 1995, directing Reclamation to amend New Magma's repayment contract and restructure its repayment terms. Contract was amended November 22, 1996.</p> <p>The Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District failed to make its February 1, 1994, distribution system payment. On August 12, 1994, Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District filed Chapter 9 bankruptcy to reorganize its debts. Agreement was reached in bankruptcy court in 1996. An amended repayment contract was scheduled for April 1997; however, it was delayed in order to reorganize the debt. On March 4, 1999, the repayment debt and schedule were determined.</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
Central Arizona Project (CAP) (Continued)	<p>On May 19, 1995, Maricopa-Stanfield Irrigation and Drainage District requested deferment of its semi-annual payments due August 1995 and February 1996. They also requested a deferment contract for restructuring its repayment debt to avoid petitioning for Chapter 9 bankruptcy. Reclamation granted the deferment contract. An agreement signed June 28, 1996, changed the payout schedule from 26 to 39 years, allowing the district to meet the full repayment obligation.</p> <p>The repayment allocations recalculations for joint works were recalculated in 2004 resulting in an amended repayment contract for the San Tan Irrigation District. The prepared and negotiated amendment is currently under federal review and is scheduled to be executed by early calendar year 2005.</p>
Central Valley Project	We are currently in various stages of negotiating long-term water service renewal contracts with entities/individuals that have Central Valley Project (CVP) water service contracts. Below shows the status of CVP water service contracts as of December 3, 2004.
<u>American River Division</u> Auburn-Folsom South Unit	There are 7 contracts with entities in this unit. Six of the long-term water service renewal contracts are currently in the 60-day public review and comment period. One entity, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) will not be ready to execute a long-term water service renewal contract by February 28, 2005, the target date for execution of the long-term water service renewal contracts. SMUD's existing contract does not expire until 2012.
<u>Delta Division</u>	There are 24 contracts with entities in this unit. Twenty-three of the long term water service renewal contracts are currently in the 60-day public review and comment period, and one other is projected to be released for public comment in three to four months. One entity has an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.
<u>East Side Division</u> New Melones Unit	There are 2 contracts with entities in this unit. These 2 contracts do not expire until 2022. There have been no contract negotiations for a long-term water service renewal contract with the 2 entities. In addition to the 2 existing contracts, subsection 3404(b) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) provides that the United States is authorized to enter into a long-term water service contract with Tuloumne Utilities District, an entity located in this unit.
<u>Friant Division</u>	<p>There are 27 existing long-term water service renewal contracts with entities in this division for Class I and/or Class II CVP water. These contracts were executed in January or February 2001. These 27 contracts are for a term of 25 years and are subject to CVPIA. Additionally, 2 of the entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.</p> <p>There are 3 other contracts with entities in this division. The 60-day public review and comment period has been completed for all 3 of the long-term water service renewal contracts.</p>
<u>Friant Division (Cross Valley Canal)</u>	There are 8 contracts with entities in this Division. All 8 long-term water service renewal contracts have been negotiated but have not been released for the 60-day public review and comment period.

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p>Central Valley Project (Continued)</p> <p><u>Sacramento River Division</u> Black Butte Dam and Lake</p> <p>Corning/Tehama-Colusa Canals</p> <p>Sacramento River Settlement</p> <p><u>San Felipe Division</u></p> <p><u>Shasta Division</u></p> <p><u>Trinity River Division</u></p> <p><u>West San Joaquin Division</u> Delta-Mendota Canal</p> <p>San Luis Unit</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p><u>General</u></p>	<p>There are 6 contracts with entities in this unit. One of the 6, Elk Creek Community Services District, does not intend to renew their contract. The 60-day public review and period has been completed for the remaining 5 long-term water service renewal contracts.</p> <p>There are 16 contracts with entities in this unit. The 60-day public review and comment period has been completed for all 16 long-term water service renewal contracts. Four entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.</p> <p>There are 141 contracts with individuals/entities in this unit. The 60-day public review and comment period has been completed for all 141 long-term water service renewal contracts.</p> <p>There are 2 contracts with entities in this unit. These contracts do not expire until 2027. Negotiations for long-term water service renewal contracts are ongoing.</p> <p>There are 6 contracts with entities in this unit. The 60-day public review and comment period has been completed on all 6 long-term water service renewal contracts.</p> <p>There are 4 contracts with entities in this unit. The 60-day public review and comment period has been completed on all 4 long-term water service renewal contracts. One entity has an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.</p> <p>There are 3 contracts with entities in this unit. All are currently in the 60-day public review and comment period.</p> <p>There are 5 contracts with entities in this unit. Four of the 5 long-term water service renewal contracts are out for the 60-day public review and comment period. Westlands Water District, whose contract expires in 2007, is still in negotiations. Additionally, 2 of the entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system</p> <p>There are a total of 254 contracts identified about of which 86 are interim renewal contracts. Interim renewal contracts are subject to the provisions of CVPIA and the acreage limitations of the Reclamation Reform Act.</p> <p>The 141 Sacramento River contracts were to expire on March 31, 2004. On December 1, 2003, Congress passed Public Law 108-137, which provides that the Secretary of the Interior extend the 141 contracts for up to 2 years or until renewal contracts are executed.</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I	Repayment contract with the Coachella Valley Water District for lining of the Coachella Canal was executed March 14, 1978, and validated June 30, 1978. The cost of the Desalting Complex is non-reimbursable. Amendments to the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act changed the provisions of the Coachella Valley Water District Contract from reimbursable to non-reimbursable.
Lewis and Clark Rural Water System	Cooperative Agreement was signed June 29, 2001, with the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project	Repayment contract was signed May 2, 1995, with the Mid-Dakota Rural Water System, Incorporated. Obligation will be met with FY 2005 appropriation; repayment will begin FY 2006.
Mni Wiconi Project	No repayment contracts are anticipated. Cooperative agreements providing for work and commitment of non-Federal funds were executed prior to construction.
Perkins County Rural Water System	Cooperative Agreement was signed August 12, 2002, with Perkins County Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required.
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit	Execution of the master contract with Garrison Diversion Conservancy District and three-way contracts between Reclamation, Conservancy District, and Irrigation Districts, containing approximately 113,000 acres of irrigable land, was completed March 16, 1966. Court validation was completed July 26, 1966, and confirmed August 10, 1966. Renegotiation to conform to the reformulation legislation must occur prior to construction activity in irrigation areas. Cooperative Agreement for municipal, rural, and industrial water was executed November 19, 1986. Grant Agreement for North Dakota Wetlands Trust was executed on December 18, 1986. A supplementary agreement for the State cost-share was executed on February 14, 1991, as required by the 1986 Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act. A renegotiated repayment contract with Garrison Diversion Conservancy District has not been completed. Renegotiation of a repayment contract is being deferred pending the outcome of the Red River Valley Water Supply Study which was directed by the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Project	Repayment is non-reimbursable under Section 309(g)(7) of the Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act as amended in Title III of the Arizona Water Settlements Act.

		Summary of Irrigation Investments									Annual Charges Per Acre		
Project	Total Irrigation Investment Per Acre	Irrigators	Power Rev.	Cost Share Agric.	UCRBF Rev.	Ad Valorem Tax	CRDF & Cont. Funds	Indian Irr. Defer.	Non-Fed Contribution	Settlement Land Sales	Annual Charge	Investment Costs	Operations
Central Arizona Project	3435.57	75.32	982.12					2378.13			81.00	2.00	79.00
Central Valley Project 1/ American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Folsom Dam Gate Repairs Delta Division Miscellaneous Projects Sacramento Division San Felipe Division San Joaquin Division West San Joaquin Division- San Luis Unit Shasta Division Trinity River													
Colorado River Storage Project					2/								
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I	585.00	0.00 3/									N/A	N/A	N/A
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison 4/	6220.00								2.00		32.01	N/A	55.22
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Prj	5216.11							5216.11			N/A	N/A	N/A

1/ Irrigation investment is to be repaid from water and power revenues collected at the project level in compliance with the operationally and financially integrated project provision included in the project authorization. Each division and unit is part of the total project; some divisions develop water supplies and other divisions and units

deliver those water supplies. Irrigation investment data for the total authorized Central Valley Project are shown below:

Summary of Irrigation Investment	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Acres</u>	
Total irrigation investment per acre	\$392	1,214,314,582	<u>A/</u>	
Less repayment of irrigation investment per acre by:				
Irrigators	-39	120,918,750	<u>A/</u>	
Capital Relief	<u>-7</u>	21,101,320	<u>A/</u>	
Unpaid Capital per Acre	346			
Payment capacity per acre-foot	\$12.07 to \$20.06		<u>B/</u>	
Annual rates per acre-foot:				
Construction	\$0 to \$22.72		<u>C/</u>	
Operation and maintenance	\$7.59 to \$20.07		<u>C/</u>	
Deficit	.00 to \$15.77		<u>C/</u>	

A/ Based on 3,096,290 acres in the project service area that were irrigated with water supplied by the Central Valley Project in 1993, as reported in Reclamation's 1993 Crop Production Report, the irrigation plant investment repayment and capital relief are included in the 2004 water rates for the period through September 2002.

B/ Based on the 2004 irrigation water rates.

C/ Irrigation water rates are expressed in terms of dollars per acre-foot scheduled for delivery during the current year. Cost of service rates for all the individual contractors are adjusted annually to reflect changes in project costs and available water supplies. Annual charges shown above are the lowest and highest cost of service rates calculated for the individual contractors in Reclamation's 2004 CVP Irrigation Water Rates. Out-of-basin facility rates are not included above but the out-of-basin capital rates developed are in the mid-\$40 range.

2/ The irrigation investment for Colorado River Storage Project (CRSP) Participating Projects is to be repaid from irrigators, miscellaneous contributions, and power revenues from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (UCRBF). A summary of irrigation repayment estimates for the CRSP Participating Projects is shown below:

Repayment by Irrigators	\$ 67,975,000
Non-Reimbursable	8,998,000
CRDF & Contributions	112,713,000
Indian Irrigation Deferral	5,670,000
<u>UCRBF Revenue</u> <u>A/</u>	<u>1,180,754,000</u>
Total	\$1,376,110,000

A/ Amount shows the sum of the UCRBF revenues under the existing repayment schedules, within the 50-year repayment period of any irrigation repayment block, and based on the FY 2003 power repayment study. The Inspector General's Audit No. BOR 98-I-150, "Recovery of Irrigation Investment Costs", requested that information should be provided annually showing the present value of UCRBF revenues to assist irrigation repayment under existing schedules, and the present value of a straight-line amortization of UCRBF revenue payments. The 2003 annual interest rate of 4.96 percent for 20-year Treasury constant maturities was used to calculate these present values. The present value for the current schedule of UCRBF revenues to assist irrigation repayment is estimated to be

\$329,699,000 and the present value of a straight-line amortization is estimated to be \$433,187,000.

- 3/ Based on 78,530 acres of agricultural land in the Coachella Valley taken from 1996 crop census. All the irrigation investment is non-reimbursable since Reclamation is using the facilities to meet salinity requirements under the Mexican Water Treaty and provisions of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act.
- 4/ The annual operation and maintenance cost exceeds payment capacity under the current allocation. Federal funds were not included for irrigation development in the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.